



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

methods in textual criticism. Professor Blass calmly throws all such methods away, and lays down as a fundamental authority that we are to look, not simply to the age of a reading, but to its intrinsic value. As might be expected, such a fast and loose criterion leads its user into some troubled waters. Alexandrian readings are made of the same value as a combination of A, B, and \aleph . Supported by Latin ϵ , he accepts a reading of Marcion as true in Luke, because it is not like the reading in other gospels. This accepted reading is what Jesus really said, and, therefore, since Matthew and Mark do not agree with it, Matthew and Mark's reading is wrong! Yet Professor Blass pleads for a sound textual criticism! A certain class of writers may obtain consolation from some of Professor Blass' conclusions, but it seems a pity that one who has rendered such immense service to New Testament study in other departments should have committed himself to views such as these and others which might be mentioned. S. M.

Paul: The Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher. By ORELLO CONE, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. xii + 465. \$2.

In the present volume Dr. Cone has gathered together a number of exceedingly painstaking studies upon the teaching of Paul, to which he has prefixed a few chapters upon the man himself. So far as the biographical element is concerned, Dr. Cone makes little or no use of Acts, trusting entirely to the epistles. He is singularly indifferent to questions of chronology and geography, and his critical position is one which seems altogether too radical even for a follower of Weizsäcker. A strong case is naturally made from the differences between the epistles and the Acts, but one cannot help questioning whether such differences are not an argument for the authenticity of Acts, or at least for a very early date of composition; otherwise why should not later writers have used the epistles which must have been in greater or less circulation? More than that, merely as a matter of detail, why should Dr. Cone refer always to Saul of *Tarsus* if Acts be ruled out? If he were a "Hebrew of the Hebrews," why was he not an inhabitant of Palestine? But such criticism really does not touch the main purpose of the book. This is essentially to set forth the teaching of Paul. Here, again, as a minor feature of method, one questions the legitimacy of ruling out Acts to begin with, and then using portions of it to establish a crude supernaturalism on the part of Paul. In fact,

both in the case of supernaturalism and in the matter of the atonement we feel that Dr. Cone has unduly emphasized elements which were the formal rather than the essential parts of Paul's thought. There can be no question, however, as to the value of the book as a whole. It is marked by exhaustive study, and oftentimes is exceedingly helpful. Altogether, one must say it is one which demands careful consideration as an able and critical, though too often unsympathetic, presentation of Paulinism. S. M.

The Book of Daniel from the Christian Standpoint, with Essay on Alleged Historical Difficulties, by the Editor of the *Babylonian and Oriental Record*. By JOHN KENNEDY, M.A., D.D.; being Vol. VII of "The Bible Student's Library." New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co. Pp. xii + 219; with illustrations. \$2.50.

The title of this book is puzzling. It might mean a judgment of the teachings of the book of Daniel from the point of view of Christian principles, or the use of the book of Daniel as illustrative of Christian teachings. As the Christian standpoint would admit either of these suppositions, we must turn to the contents of the book to determine which is meant. To our surprise the author takes an entirely different turn. He gives us a critical discussion of the book. How a Christian standpoint can affect one's critical judgment of evidence, except possibly to make one more conscientious and earnest in seeking for the truth, is not evident, but the author believes that it settles the matter for the traditional view of the authorship, composition, and date of the book of Daniel. For those who believe in a Christian geology and a Christian mathematics, and desire also a Christian science of biblical criticism, this book will be hailed with satisfaction. G. S. G.

The Life and Letters of Paul the Apostle. By LYMAN ABBOTT. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1898. Pp. xii + 332. \$1.50.

This volume of Dr. Abbott's is one of a "series of wholly independent volumes which attempts to apply the principles of evolution to the elucidation of spiritual truth." All readers of the author's writings need not be told that it is written in a delightful style, and that it is marked by a great breadth of thought, and with singular